



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,947	04/08/2004	Eric D. Brill	MS307421.1/MSFTP594US	9717
27195	7590	03/15/2007	EXAMINER	
AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			KIM, PAUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/15/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/820,947	BRILL ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Paul Kim	2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/7/2004</u>  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed on 15 January 2007.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending and present for examination. Claim 1 is independent.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

3. Applicant's election of claims 1-16 in the reply filed on 15 January 2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 07 July 2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim recites "a features." It is assumed that Applicant intended the claim to recite "a feature" and for the purposes of this examination, the present claim will be treated as such. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2161

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. **Claims 1-7, 10-11, and 13-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vanderveldt et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,668, hereinafter referred to as Vanderveldt), filed on 4 August 1999, and issued on 24 July 2001.

8. **As per independent claim 1**, Vanderveldt teaches:

A system that ranks search results, comprising:

- a first component that determines a relevance of respective search results via one or more feature-based relevance functions {See Vanderveldt, C10:L37-46, wherein this reads over "[t]he dynamic search would then proceed to 'spider' to each of the links contained in each page, according to a function of the relevance"}; and
- a second component that orders the search results based on the respective relevances {See Vanderveldt, C11:L4-5, wherein this reads over "[r]elevant information is filtered and presented to the user making the inquiry"}.

9. **As per dependent claim 2**, Vanderveldt teaches:

The system of claim 1, the one or more feature-based relevance functions utilize features that include at least one of:

- one or more text-based relevance scores {See Vanderveldt, C10:L43-46, wherein this reads over "the relevance function would consist of simple text matching and counting of keyword occurrences"};
- a comparison between text-based relevance scores with different scopings;
- an occurrence of a word in a thread position relative to a posting;
- an occurrence of a word-class in a thread position relative to a posting;
- an occurrence of a phrase in a thread position relative to a posting;
- an inferred label on an edge between a posting and the posting's parent;
- an inferred label on an edge between a posting and the posting's child;
- a number of messages in a thread;
- a thread depth;
- a thread maximal branching factor;
- a thread linguistic property;
- a posting depth;

Art Unit: 2161

- a number of descendants of a posting;
- a number of children in a posting;
- a number of postings per time duration;
- a number of newsgroups posted;
- a number of postings that have no responses;
- a probability that a posting is relevant given the posting is from a particular newsgroup; and
- a probability a posting from a particular newsgroup is relevant given a query.

Additionally, it is noted that because the remainder of features listed in the present claim are optionally recited within the claim, they will not be given further consideration nor will prior art be applied for the purposes of this examination.

**10. As per dependent claim 3, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 1, the relevance functions are generated based on one or more of scoped lexical information {See Vanderveldt, C10:L43-46, wherein this reads over "the relevance function would consist of simple text matching and counting of keyword occurrences"}, a digital artifact attribute, and a source repository attribute.

Additionally, it is noted that because the remainder of features (i.e. "digital artifact attribute" and "source repository attribute") listed in the present claim are optionally recited within the claim, they will not be given further consideration nor will prior art be applied for the purposes of this examination.

**11. As per dependent claim 4, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 1, the search results are associated with searches over one or more collections of digital artifacts {See Vanderveldt, C9:L35-40, wherein this reads over "Web servers, Highspeed Internet Connections, Web pages, Health-related Databases"}.

**12. As per dependent claim 5, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 4, the collections of digital artifacts comprise data associated with one or more of a Usenet, a mailing list, a discussion thread, a wiky, a blog, an archived community discussion, a chat room, a web page, a database, and a list {See Vanderveldt, C9:L35-40, wherein this reads over "Web servers, Highspeed Internet Connections, Web pages, Health-related Databases"}.

Art Unit: 2161

Additionally, it is noted that because the remainder of features (i.e. "a Usenet, a mailing list, a discussion thread, a wiki, a blog, an archived community discussion, a chat room") listed in the present claim are optionally recited within the claim, they will not be given further consideration nor will prior art be applied for the purposes of this examination.

**13. As per dependent claim 6, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 1, further comprising a function generator that creates the relevance functions based on at least one of a training set, a feature set, a probability, an inference, a classifier, a heuristic, and user specified criteria {See Vanderveldt, C10:L37-39, wherein this reads over "[b]ased upon the top N (adjustable by the user) results returned by the static search, the dynamic search would assign a relevance to each page"}.

Additionally, it is noted that because the remainder of features (i.e. "a training set, a feature set, a probability, an inference, a classifier, a heuristic") listed in the present claim are optionally recited within the claim, they will not be given further consideration nor will prior art be applied for the purposes of this examination.

**14. As per dependent claim 7, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 1, the relevance functions are refined based on a user's response to the ranked search results {See Vanderveldt, C10:L37-39, wherein this reads over "[b]ased upon the top N (adjustable by the user) results returned by the static search, the dynamic search would assign a relevance to each page"}.

**15. As per dependent claim 10, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 1, the relevance functions associate relevance weights with respective search results and the ranking of the search results is based on the relevance weight {See Vanderveldt, C4:L43-46, wherein this reads over "allowing reduced weight for synonym and possible misspelling matches"}.

**16. As per dependent claim 11, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 1, the relevance functions are generated via machine learning {See Vanderveldt, C4:L60-65, wherein this reads over "generated by a neural network trained upon the user profile and previous searches and relevance results"}.

**17. As per dependent claim 13, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 1, the one or more feature-based relevance functions utilize a features that are obtained by extracting information from digital artifacts {See Vanderveldt, C4:L39-42, wherein this reads over "extract/provide useful information from publicly and freely available databases"}.

**18. As per dependent claim 14, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 1, further comprising a thresholding component that defines one or more acceptable relevance levels in order to mitigate providing non-relevant search results to a user {See Vanderveldt, C4:L54-65, wherein this reads over “[a]fter a maximum number of links have been followed, or the total relevance of pages indexed exceeds a threshold, the search stops and results 0 are returned to the user”}.

**19. As per dependent claim 15, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 14, the acceptable relevance levels are configured for at least one of an application and the user {See Vanderveldt, C9:L1-5, wherein this reads over “[d]epending on the profile, the presentation will rate, weigh and organize each search to present the most relevant and related topics of interest”}.

**20. As per dependent claim 16, Vanderveldt teaches:**

The system of claim 14, the acceptable relevance levels dynamically adjust based on the user's response to search results {See Vanderveldt, C9:L18-21, wherein this reads over “[o]ver time, the profile information database will continue to grow and become more intelligent. Therefore, each subsequent search will become more intelligent and relevant to the previous user”}.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

**21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**22. Claim 8-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderveldt, in view of Official Notice.**

**23. As per dependent claim 8, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that “the relevance functions are probabilities that respective digital artifacts are relevant to a search.” That is, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily acknowledge that relevance functions are simply a measure of how closely related the user's query is related to the data source.**

Art Unit: 2161

24. **As per dependent claim 9,** the Examiner takes Official Notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the “relevance function is defined as Relevance ( $V(posting, query)$ ), which is a relevance weight of a posting given a query, wherein function ( $V(posting, query)$ ) returns a set of features and feature values for a particular posting and query.” That is, since relevance functions are simply a measure of how closely related the user’s query is related to the data source, the relevant function would necessarily contain and operate upon the variables of the “posting” and the “query.”

25. **As per dependent claim 12,** the Examiner takes Official Notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the machine learning includes “a linear regression.” That is, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily acknowledge that a linear regression is a commonly used regression method in statistics wherein it provides for a relation of the response to the explanatory variables which is a linear function of some parameters.

Additionally, it is noted that because the remainder of features (i.e. “a non-linear regression, and a support vector machine”) listed in the present claim are optionally recited within the claim, they will not be given further consideration nor will prior art be applied for the purposes of this examination.

### ***Conclusion***

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-2737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul Kim  
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161  
TECH Center 2100

*Armen M. Mays  
Spec. TC 2100  
SPE 10/2008*